REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated July 21, 2009 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 12-17, 19, 21-26, 28, 30-35 and 37 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

1. Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 12-17, 19, 21-26, 28, 30-35 and 37 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 01/28192 by Sharp (hereinafter "Sharp").

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as previously presented are not anticipated by Sharp. However, in order to facilitate prosecution of the application and in a *bona fide* attempt to advance the application to allowance, the Applicants present this response with amendment to clarify particular aspects of the claimed invention. These amendments make more clear what is believed to have been originally set forth in these claims, but now states so more specifically.

For example, independent Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that a control unit constitutes a collection of both received unanswered call data and at least one saved text message by combining together the unanswered call data and messages, which both refer to the same caller, into a single contact attempt related to the caller The text message is descriptive of a reason for the unanswered call data, and the contact attempt is presented together with the content of the text message to indicate the reason for the unanswered call data. Independent Claims 10, 19, and 28 have been similarly amended. These amendments are fully supported in the Application as filed (e.g., FIGS 3B-C and paragraph 0024), and no new matter has been added. For example, paragraph 0024 of the Specification states:

> In this embodiment the control unit 208 is configured to receive a selection regarding a contact attempt from the user interface 212 and to display the selected contact attempt in more detail in the user interface 212. In our example, the person that has been called selects the contact attempt relating to Mark, and according to Figure 3C details 312 of the contact attempt are shown. Also the number of calls (one in our example) and the number of messages (one in our example) from the same caller can be shown. Also the message sent by the caller is shown on the display 102.

8

Sharp at least fails to disclose combining unanswered call data and messages into a single contact attempt. At page 18, lines 12-18, Sharp describes a message received state displaying information containing "the name or number of the message sender, followed by the message" in response to the message being received. However, nowhere does Sharp expressly or inherently describe combining the either message notification or message text with unanswered call data. At lines 24-28 of page 18, Sharp states that

> When a call has been missed the caller details are stored in the phone's memory and the state of the phone changes to a missed call state. In response to this change the processor causes the display to present text indicating that a call or calls have been missed- e.g. "1 call missed","2. calls missed" etc.

Thus, Sharp describes two entirely different states for incoming text messages and missed call data, and therefore there is no reasonable basis to conclude that Sharp describes combining the missed call data with the text message information, much less combining these data into a single contact attempt that refers to the same caller. For at least this reason, Sharp fails to anticipate independent Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28.

Dependent Claims 3-8, 12-17, 21-26, 30-35, and 37 depend from independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28, respectively. Each of these dependent claims also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharp. While Applicants do not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, including any assertions concerning inherency or the taking of Official Notice, these rejections are now moot in view of the remarks made in connection with independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from Sharp. Therefore, dependent Claims 3-8, 12-17, 21-26, 30-35, and 37 are also allowable over Sharp.

Applicants further note the amendments to dependent Claims 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16, 22, 24, 25, 31, 33, and 34 which were necessitated by the amendments to independent Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28. These amendments are fully supported in the Specification as filed (e.g., FIGS. 3B-C) and no new matter has been added. Therefore, entry and allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NKO.011.US) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: October 29, 2009   By: /William B. Ashley/

William B. Ashley
Reg. No. 51,419

10